



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/986,223	10/22/2001	Gerhard Mueller	30051/37886	4981

4743 7590 06/17/2003

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN
6300 SEARS TOWER
233 SOUTH WACKER
CHICAGO, IL 60606-6357

EXAMINER

PARSLEY, DAVID J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3643

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/986,223

Applicant(s)

MUELLER ET AL.

Examiner

David J Parsley

Art Unit

3643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9-11,13-19,21 and 22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7,9-11,13-19,21 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Detailed Action

Amendment

1. This office action is in response to applicant's amendment (paper no. 11) dated 4-2-03 and this action is final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3/1, 4-5, 10, 13-14, 16-17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,766,713 to Evans.

Referring to claim 1, Evans discloses a sausage-producing device comprising in combination a stuffing unit – see column 5 lines 29-31, with a charging pipe – at 22 and 30 for stuffing sausage skins, a length-dimensioning unit – at 26 for controlled removal of the stuffed sausage skins, and a clip module – the device as seen in figure 2 which supports and powers the clippers – 33 and 35, for closing the stuffed sausage skins arranged directly after the length-dimensioning unit – 26 when seen in the direction of transport of the stuffed sausage skins, and wherein a control means – see for example column 5 lines 51-61, is provided to synchronize the

Art Unit: 3643

functions of the stuffing unit, clip and the length dimensioning unit – see for example figures 1-14 and columns 1-12.

Referring to claim 3/1, Evans discloses the clip module includes a cutter – see for example column 6 lines 5-10.

Referring to claim 4, Evans discloses the clip module includes a loop former – 48.

Referring to claim 5, Evans discloses when seen in the direction of transport of the stuffed sausage skins, the clip module is followed by a transfer unit – 56.

Referring to claim 10, Evans discloses a method of producing sausages comprising the steps of stuffing sausage skins via a charging pipe – at 22 and 30, transporting the stuffed sausage skins away in a controlled manner via a length-dimensioning unit – 26, and closing the stuffed sausage skins by a clip module – at 34 directly after the length-dimensioning unit – 26, and synchronizing – see for example column 5 lines 51-61, the functions of the stuffing unit, the clip module and the length dimensioning unit – see for example figures 1-14 and columns 1-12.

Referring to claim 13, Evans discloses closing the stuffed sausage skins with the clip module at two juxtaposed points – see for example figure 2 and columns 5-13.

Referring to claim 14, Evans discloses cutting through the stuffed sausage skins with the clip module between the two points – see for example figure 2 and columns 5-13.

Referring to claim 16, Evans discloses closing the stuffed sausage skins by the clip module twice at the twist-off point – see for example figure 2 and columns 5-13.

Referring to claim 17, Evans discloses advancing the stuffed sausage skins, which have been closed by the clip module to a transfer unit – at 56.

Referring to claim 19, Evans discloses causing the functions of the clip module to take place in synchronism with the functions of the length-dimensioning unit and the transfer unit – see for example column 5 lines 51-61.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 3/2, 6-7, 9, 11, 15, 18 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Evans as applied to claims 1, 5, 10 and 17 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,699,723 to Schliesser et al.

Referring to claims 2 and 11, Evans does not disclose the charging pipe has associated therewith a twist-off unit. Schliesser does disclose the charging pipe – 3 has associated therewith a twist-off unit – 2. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the sausage-producing device of Evans and add the twist-off unit of Schliesser, so as to easily facilitate the clipping of the ends of the sausage links.

Referring to claim 3/2, Evans as modified by Schliesser et al. further discloses the clip module includes a cutter – see for example column 6 lines 5-10 of Evans.

Referring to claims 6 and 18, Evans does not disclose when seen in the direction of transport of the stuffed sausage skins, the transfer unit is followed by a conveyor belt. Schliesser

Art Unit: 3643

et al. does disclose when seen in the direction of transport of the stuffed sausage skins, the transfer unit – 7-8 is followed by a conveyor belt – 14 – see for example figure 1 and column 2. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the sausage producing apparatus or method of Evans and add the conveyor belt following the transfer unit of Schliesser et al., so as to allow for the sausage skins to be easily and automatically transported for further processing.

Referring to claims 7 and 22, Evans does not disclose when seen in the direction of transport of the stuffed sausage skins, the transfer unit is followed by a suspension unit. Schliesser et al. does disclose when seen in the direction of transport of the stuffed sausage skins, the transfer unit – 7-8 is followed by a suspension unit – 6 – see for example figure 1. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the sausage producing device or method of Evans and add the suspension unit following the transfer unit of Schliesser et al., so as to allow for the sausage skins to be easily and automatically transported at a height easily accessed by the user for further processing.

Referring to claim 9, Evans further discloses the transfer unit – 56 is connected to the control means for the sausage-producing device via control lines so as to synchronize the functions of the transfer unit with the functions of the stuffing unit, the length-dimensioning unit and the clip module – see for example columns 1-13. Evans does not disclose the conveyor belt is connected to the control means for synchronization with the stuffing unit, length-dimensioning unit and the clip module. Schliesser et al. does disclose the conveyor belt – 14 is connected to the controls – see for example columns 1-3 and it is inherent that the conveyor belt moves in synchronization with the stuffing unit, length dimensioning unit and the clip module since it is

Art Unit: 3643

connected to these devices and is used to transport the sausages in relation to these devices. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the sausage producing device of Evans and add the conveyor belt connected to the controls for synchronization with the other components of the device of Schliesser et al., so as to make the device operate as quickly and efficiently as possible thus allowing a higher number of sausages to be produced in a shorter amount of time.

Referring to claim 21, Evans further discloses the transfer unit – 56 is connected to the control means for the sausage-producing device via control lines so as to synchronize the functions of the transfer unit with the functions of the stuffing unit, the length-dimensioning unit and the clip module – see for example columns 1-13. Evans does not disclose the suspension unit is connected to the control means for synchronization with the stuffing unit, length-dimensioning unit and the clip module. Schliesser et al. does disclose the suspension unit – at 6 is connected to the controls – see for example columns 1-3 and it is inherent that the conveyor belt moves in synchronization with the stuffing unit, length dimensioning unit and the clip module since it is connected to these devices and is used to transport the sausages in relation to these devices. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the sausage producing device of Evans and add the suspension unit connected to the controls for synchronization with the other components of the device of Schliesser et al., so as to make the device operate as quickly and efficiently as possible thus allowing a higher number of sausages to be produced in a shorter amount of time.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Evans as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,080,054 to Muller et al.

Referring to claim 15, Evans further discloses the step of cutting through is effected after each first closure, so as to obtain a single sausage. Evans does not disclose the step of cutting through is effected after each n-th closure wherein n is a selected integer, so as to obtain chains of sausages, which comprise a specific number of sausages corresponding to the selected integer n. Muller et al. does disclose the step of cutting through is effected after each n-th closure so as to obtain chains of sausages which comprise a specific number of sausages – see for example figures 1-8 and columns 1-8. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the method of producing sausages of Evans and add the step of cutting after each n-th closure of Muller et al., so as to make the device adjustable and adaptable for many different required lengths of the sausage chain.

Response to Arguments

4. Regarding claims 1 and 10 and the arguments with respect to 35 U.S.C. 103 (a), applicant's claimed invention does not state that the filled skins are first transported by a length-dimensioning unit and are therefore brought into a specific shape and length due to endless conveyor belts and are then divided precisely into individual sausages by the clip module with all sausages having the same shape and volume.

Further, the Evans reference does disclose a length-dimensioning unit – at 26 as seen above in paragraph 2 of this office action. As seen in column 4 lines 27-37 of Evans item – 26 controls the withdrawal of the casing – 28 and therefore controls the removal of the stuffed sausage skins from the device in that the speed at which the casing is moved and the subsequent length and filling of the casing is controlled by item – 26. As seen in figure 1 the clipping

module at 33,35 is located after the length dimensioning unit – at 26 with the length dimensioning unit, stuffing unit and clip module being synchronously controlled by a control means as seen in column 5 lines 51-61. Therefore, the length dimensioning unit in conjunction with the stuffing unit and the clip module can be synchronously controlled to produce a sausage of the desired size as claimed, with item – 26 controlling the rate of removal of the stuffed sausages from the device depending on how quick item – 26 allows the casing – 28 to be moved from the horn – 22.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to

Art Unit: 3643

David Parsley whose telephone number is (703) 306-0552. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Poon, can be reached at (703) 308-2574.

Charles T. Jordan
CHARLES T. JORDAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600